



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,083	10/16/2003	Ibrahim Sendijarevic	TRPI 0103 PUSP	9091
22045	7590	05/08/2006	EXAMINER	
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C. 1000 TOWN CENTER TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075				PATTERSON, MARC A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1772				

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/687,083	SENDJAREVIC ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marc A. Patterson	1772

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11, 13, 14 and 26-30.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: See attached.

ADVISORY ACTION

Acknowledgement of Applicant's Amendments

1. The amendment made in Claims 27 and 29 in the After Final Amendment filed April 20, 2006 has not been entered because the amendment raises a new issue. Claims 27 and 29, prior to amendment, were not directed to packaging comprised of a shape memory foam having the characteristic that when the foam is in an original shape and is deformed above the T_g to produce a deformed shape and cooled in the compressed shape below the T_g , the foam retains the compressed shape. The amendment therefore raises issues which would require further search and consideration to be fully considered, and the amendment has therefore not been entered. Even if the amendment were to be entered, the amended claims would not overcome the prior art of record, because as stated on page 3 of the previous Action, a shape memory foam is disclosed taught by Helsemanns et al.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

2. Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 1 – 11, 13 – 14 and 26 as being unpatentable over Schneider (U.S. Patent No. 3,415,364) in view of Helsemans et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,261) and Rosthauser (U.S. Patent No. 6,224,800 B1), 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 27 – 28 as being unpatentable over Schneider (U.S. Patent No. 3,415,364) in view of Helsemans et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,261) and Rosthauser (U.S. Patent No. 6,224,800 B1) and further in view of Hayashi et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,049,591) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 29 – 30 as being unpatentable over Schneider (U.S. Patent No. 3,415,364) in view of Helsemans et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,261) and Rosthauser (U.S. Patent

No. 6,224,800 B1) and further in view of Chaffanjon et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,594,097), of record in the previous Action, have been carefully considered but have not been found to be persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant argues, on page 7 of the remarks dated April 20, 2006, that Helsemanns et al disclose a hydrophilic foam, because Helsemanns et al comprise polyols with oxyethylene content.

However, as stated on page 3 of the previous Action, Helsemanns et al also comprise isocyanate comprising diphenylmethane diisocyanate, which is hydrophobic as taught by Rosthauser; furthermore, a foam which is entirely hydrophilic is not claimed, and it is not clear that the specification contains support for this limitation.

Applicant also argues, on page 9, that Rosthauser does not disclose polyurethane or polyol.

However, Rosthauser is cited only for the teaching that isocyanate comprising diphenylmethane diisocyanate is hydrophobic.

Applicant also argues, on page 10, that the soft segments of a polyurethane control its properties and its affinity towards water.

However, no evidence is provided that control of the properties of a polyurethane and its affinity towards water completely rests in the structure of the soft segments.

Applicant also argues, on page 11, that Hayashi et al do not disclose a crosslinked composition.

However, as stated on page 3 of the previous Action, a crosslinked composition is disclosed by Helsemanns et al.

Applicant also argues, on page 12, that Chaffanjon et al do not disclose a foam that regains its original shape after heating.

However, as stated on page 3 of the previous Action, a foam that regains its original shape after heating is disclosed by Helsemanns et al.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc A Patterson whose telephone number is 571-272-1497. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marc Patterson 5/3/06
Marc A. Patterson, PhD.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1772